

DOING MORE TO COMBAT UNDERAGE DRINKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, would not every Member of this House love to have a campaign in which they could run 93 TV ads for every TV ad run by their opponent? There is no doubt which candidate would win.

So it goes with the contest between alcohol commercials and responsible drinking ads purchased by the alcohol industry.

As reported by the Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth, in 2001 America's youth were 93 times more likely to see an ad promoting alcohol than an industry ad discouraging underage drinking. Although the liquor industry tells us their ads are not targeted at children, our children see plenty of them, and they have enormous impact on our young population. On average, in 2001, an American youngster saw 245 ads promoting alcohol products to only four ads discouraging underage drinking.

The amount of money the liquor industry spends on advertising alcohol is also astounding; and compared to what the industry spends on warnings about underage drinking it is, at best, disappointing.

For example, in the year 2001, the alcohol industry spent \$811 million to air 208,000 alcohol ads, compared to \$23 million for a mere 2,379 responsible drinking ads. In other words, the alcohol industry spent less than 3 percent of its total advertising dollars on responsible drinking. As a result, our youth saw more commercials for beer than for juice, gum, chips, sneakers or jeans, product ads that usually target a young audience.

The power of liquor advertising has been effective. While drinking under the age of 21 is illegal in all 50 States, a recent report by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University found that kids illegally spent over \$22 billion a year on alcohol and they account for 20 percent of all alcohol consumed in our Nation.

These numbers attest to the negative impact of the extensive investment the alcohol industry is making to attract consumers to their products while ignoring their responsibility to be equally diligent about ads warning about the dangers of underage drinking.

Mr. Speaker, why does it matter? It matters because the consequences of underage drinking are devastating to our youth and to our society. According to an NIH study, over 10 million kids in the U.S. consume alcohol illegally, starting, on average, at age 13. The NIH study also found that kids who began drinking before the age of 15 are four times more likely to become alcoholics than those who begin drinking after the age of 21, 22 times more

likely to use marijuana and 50 times more likely to try cocaine than kids who do not drink. That, Mr. Speaker, is why it matters.

In order to counter the alarming assault on our youth, Congress has commissioned the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to develop a strategy to reduce underage drinking with a national media campaign at its centerpiece. The report is expected in May.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the beer wholesalers and others representing the alcohol industry will be visiting congressional offices in the coming weeks to lobby for a reduction in alcohol taxes. When they do, I urge my colleagues to make it clear to the liquor industry that our children are an important and critical asset to our Nation and that we cannot afford to lose them.

I urge my colleagues to put the liquor industry on notice that it must do more than pay for their token underage drinking ads and seriously invest to inform parents and children about the dangers of underage drinking.

ASSUMING THE MANTLE OF RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I attended the dedication of a recently constructed house of worship at High Point, North Carolina. The minister reminded those of us in the congregation about the past history of the United States, our benevolence, our having offered assistance time and again to our distressed neighbors across the world.

When I heard these words, I concluded that we Americans do need to remind the world, pardon my immodesty, that we are indeed the eternal good guy. We have pulled chestnuts from the fire for many nations and many people; and some who have become beneficiaries of our benevolence conveniently become victims of amnesia.

I recently saw a televised interview, Mr. Speaker, of one protesting our involvement in Iraq, who blamed President Bush for having led us to believe that this would be brief and easy. That charge, Mr. Speaker, is misleading and inaccurate. President Bush from the very outset has made it clear that this encounter would be arduous and demanding.

I have been advised that President Clinton publicly said that this war would be quickly won. I did not hear him say it, but, if he did, it was a reckless, irresponsible conclusion. Such utterances lull observers into what could be a sense of false security and serve no good purpose to our troops.

The United Nations has been disappointing throughout this exercise.

Certain members of the U.N. need to enroll, it seems to me, in refresher leadership courses. Saddam Hussein has danced circles around the U.N., and he surely must be laughing up his sleeve.

Saddam, not unlike the school yard bully, has imposed havoc upon his people and upon his neighbors; and, not unlike the school yard bully, he will continue to destroy until someone has the fortitude to challenge him, to call his bluff.

Permit me to examine Saddam's record during his bloody regime: Thousands have disappeared in the Iraqi prison network; there are numerous accounts of torture and burning of human flesh of accused victims, children dying of starvation, starvation accelerated by Saddam, women notoriously raped in the presence of third parties; and, once this evil dictator is removed, I am confident many additional unbelievable horrible accounts will surface.

Enter President Bush, enter Prime Minister Tony Blair, enter Spain and Australia and others. These leaders have decided the time has come to take on the school yard bully.

Many insist that this is a unilateral operation. Not true. There are many supporters, but they are reluctant to openly oppose Saddam. They fear him. They in fact, Mr. Speaker, are afraid. Many of his neighbors loathe Saddam, but they stand in fear. But the Bush-Blair wagon will move forward with the support, albeit sometimes anonymous, of other nations.

Some observers have suggested that the U.N. should remove the United States from the U.N. Kick the United States out, they say. I have an alternative suggestion: Certain members of the U.N. should be led to the gate that leads to the road out of the country. They might be advised to follow that road if they are unable and are unwilling to assume the mantle of responsible leadership.

Mr. Speaker, meanwhile, the liberation of Iraq advances, as we continue to keep our troops and their families and the troops of our neighbors and their families in our thoughts and prayers.

UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, MALARIA AND TUBERCULOSIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the Committee on International Relations recently introduced H.R. 1298, the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis Act. The bill is a 5-year, \$15 billion bill providing \$3 billion in relief in each of these 5 years. It provides no minimum for U.S. contributions to the Global Fund and authorizes a maximum of \$1 billion for fiscal

year 2004 and such sums as necessary in the ensuing 4 years.

□ 1245

The bill provides the limitation that "no U.S. contribution to the Global Fund may cause a total amount of U.S. Government contributions to exceed 33 percent of the total amount of funds contributed to the Global Fund from all other sources."

This encourages other countries to step up to the plate also and other philanthropists around the world.

This bill is a start. It is the first step in a long and difficult journey we must take in the effort to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.

Sixty-five million people have been infected with HIV since the epidemic began, 65 million people; and 25 million of them have died. Fourteen million children have been orphaned. The numbers are not only staggering; they are devastating, and they are growing.

I am glad to see this bill authorizes up to \$1 billion next year for the Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria; but we need to offer more.

United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan has asked each of the 25 richest democracies in the world to contribute seven-tenths of 1 percent of their gross domestic product towards world hunger, world poverty, and in combating infectious disease, seven-tenths of 1 percent. Only four countries have committed that figure and have contributed that figure. The United States contributes less than one-tenth of 1 percent of its gross domestic product, ranking as dead last among the 25 wealthy industrial democracies in the world in terms of what we do in foreign aid to combat poverty and infectious disease.

In the upcoming years, we will spend estimates upward of \$100 billion to rebuild Iraq. Yet we have been unwilling to spend more than one-fifth of 1 percent of that amount, \$200 million so far, to save the lives of millions of people around the world.

A physician with the World Health Organization remarked recently, "There are certain problems the U.S. simply cannot solve on its own, much as it would like to believe otherwise."

Bilateral aid programs are important tools and should not be discounted, but they are not enough. Too often they are BandAids placed on a hemorrhaging patient. To successfully turn the tide against HIV/AIDS, against tuberculosis, against malaria, diseases that kill 6 million people around the world each year, will take the largest multilateral coalition imaginable. Simply put, it will take the entire world to save the world. That level of commitment is not fully on our radar screen, but it needs to be. The Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB, and malaria represents the best tool we have to provide relief on a scale that will really matter.

I started this speech, Mr. Speaker, with numbers, and I will leave my col-

leagues with some numbers. Thirteen thousand new AIDS infections every day, 2,000 of them in children under age 15; 8,500 AIDS deaths a day; 20 million AIDS orphans are projected in Africa by 2010. Mr. Speaker, 1,100 people in India every day die from tuberculosis.

Take a moment to think about what these numbers really mean. Every day we fail to act, every day we fail to take the necessary action, these numbers increase. Every dollar we fail to provide today will cost us 100 times that tomorrow. U.S. failure to properly commit to the Global Fund is not just unfortunate, it is shameful. In 20 years, we will tell our children that we did all we could to combat the tide of these epidemics, or we will be forced to tell them that we failed the world.

SUPPORTING OUR TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on the war in Iraq. Most of us voted for the resolution to authorize the President to use force in Iraq to help solve the problem of weapons of mass destruction. Voting for that resolution makes us at least somewhat responsible for the young men and women in the military going into harm's way. And even though we know it is the right thing to do, it still gives one pause for all of the suffering and the sorrow. Now we have several of our military who have been captured, or missing, or who have died. The challenge for this country is that if Saddam gets away with it, other tyrants in other rogue nations think that it also is going to be to their advantage to develop these weapons of mass destruction. This will make the world much less secure and this country much less secure.

I pray for not only the young men and women soldiers, but for their families. When I was 21 years old, we got a phone call notifying us that my brother, Chan, who was 23, that his jet plane went down and that he was killed. That grief never left our family. So the sacrifice is great for families. I, for one, am convinced that the war is the right thing to do. If we were to delay, it would mean that much greater of a challenge for us in the future.

Recently a newspaper in my district in Michigan ran an editorial saying that people have the right to protest against the war; and they do, certainly. But now that we are in the war, I think we should encourage everybody to rethink what protesting does. Before we went in, maybe you can protest and maybe it is going to end up in a decision not to be there. But now, we have thousands of our young men and women over there that need our support. We are in combat. Imagine an

analogy where a mom did not want her son to go out for boxing because it is too dangerous, or football; but once the decision was made, does she not cheer him and go to the game and cheer him on? Or a mom and dad that did not want their daughter to go out for basketball because, after all, that was sort of wrong for a young lady to do. That was a boy's sport. But once that young lady goes out for the team, the parents cheer her on and say, good game, do your best. Or what happened in Vietnam when we literally spat on some of our soldiers and sailors when they came home?

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that to demonstrate against the war makes the challenge for our military greater. As an old Air Force veteran I assure my colleagues that it is true, it makes it harder for our military, when people now demonstrate and say, look, you are doing an immoral thing, you are doing the wrong thing. It makes it that much more difficult.

We are in it. Let us cheer for our team and give our total support for the action of our military men and women that are now over in this war in Iraq. Give them our prayers and certainly give their families and their loved ones our prayers.

QUESTIONING THE MATRICULA CONSULAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a problem that should be at the forefront of our agenda as we move into the 108th Congress. Our immigration system today needs improvement. Unfortunately, it took a tragedy to remind us about this.

This country, of course, was based upon immigration. It was what has made us strong and all Americans recognize its importance. But this system needs improvement. We must continue to facilitate the entry of those men and women who make productive citizens, yet continue to filter those who are not eligible and those who could bring harm to our way of life.

As a body, we recently moved the INS to the Department of Homeland Security, a measure that signals a return to our security. This administration has realized the fact that reorganization must take place before we can take steps to reform our immigration system.

At no other time in our Nation's history have we faced more of a threat to our domestic security; but as we make strides towards improved security measures, I am deeply concerned that countries, even those who are considered allies, are lining up to compromise our work.

Every day, Mr. Speaker, thousands of illegal immigrants stream across our